

REMARKS:

Claims 29-37 are in the case and presented for consideration.

The drawing attached to the amendment filed on November 25, 2003 was objected to for failing to conform with drawing replacement requirements. The examiner indicated that it was not clear whether the drawing was meant to be a drawing amendment/change or to make some point. Applicant thanks the examiner for pointing this out. Applicant did not intend to make a drawing amendment/change. The drawing was only submitted to better illustrate applicant's arguments.

The examiner has further indicated that applicant's drawing was not supported by the specification. Specifically, the examiner has indicated that the specification is silent as to whether the ducts are supported by the spindle and whether they are behind the spindle. Applicant notes that the feature which was objected to by the examiner does not need to be described in the specification. The feature is common to all the tool heads in which the suction ducts are not placed inside the fork support. It is not unusual that the suction ducts are made of a flexible pipe fastened to the head support like in the enclosed photograph, and in any case the ducts are not mounted on the chuck, which must have the possibility of rotating of 360°. Thus, one skilled in the art is familiar with this common feature.

Claims 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 35-36 have been drafted to avoid the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, and are believed to be in proper form.

Claims 29 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,385,436 to Corsi. Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's rejection on the grounds that Corsi '436 fails to teach at least one limitation recited by

applicant's rewritten claims.

Independent claims 29 and 33 have both been rewritten. Claim 29 newly recites:

said second support has a coupling means for detachable connection to the chuck unit; said chuck unit being connectable to said power transmission system via a detachable coupling comprising parts brought into contact with each other and clamped with a straight approach movement. [emphasis added]

Claim 33 newly recites:

the first support includes a power transmission system and means for detachably connecting the power transmission system to the chuck unit; and a rotating support fitted to the first support, the chuck unit being detachably mounted on the rotating support [emphasis added]

Corsi '436 fails to teach or suggest a detachable connection between a second or rotating support as recited in claims 29 and 33, or a detachable coupling or connection between a power transmission unit and a chuck unit.

Furthermore, the examiner has indicated in the present Office Action that chuck 4 of the prior art is considered to be "interchangeable" in that it is "able" to be interchanged with another chuck unit, i.e., by manually replacing the chuck 4 shown in Figure 1 with another one, whether or not the device has to be taken apart to do so. Applicant now submits that according to the presently claimed invention, the chuck unit is interchangeable because of the recited detachable connections, which the prior art does not teach or suggest. Applicant's disclosure states on page 5, lines 9-13 that:

chuck unit 5 can easily be removed, as it is only connected to the transmission devices via a coupling which requires the two parts to be brought into contact within one another and clamped with a simple, straight approach movement; it can therefore be detached with no need to remove any part of the head, merely by activating grippers 15 to release shanks or pins 14 and disconnect the electric and hydraulic couplings.

Thus, the presently claimed invention requires not only an interchangeable chuck unit,

but also detachable connections/couplings which facilitate the interchangeability without disassembling the tool head, taking the device apart, or requiring any tools for disassembly. The claimed invention is exemplified in the MPEG Movie file which has been enclosed on the cd accompanying this amendment. The MPEG movie is entitled <<G93-059-headswap1-new.mpg>> and can viewed on an IBM-compatible computer.

Applicant further reiterates that chuck 4 of Corsi '436 is not replaceable as the examiner suggests.

Also, applicant reiterates that ducts 23 and 24 are behind the spindle and do not interfere with removal of the chuck. As explained above and shown in the accompanying photograph, it is not unusual for suction ducts to be made of a flexible pipe fastened to the head support, particularly where ducts are not placed inside the fork support. In any case, the duct are obviously not mounted on the chuck, which is the critical point, since the chuck must have a rotation of 360°.

Claim 34 depends from claim 33, and therefore, is believed to be novel and nonobvious for the same reasons as stated above for claim 33.

Claim 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,385,436 to Corsi as applied to claims 33-34, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,652,190 to Corsi. The examiner has indicated that the '436 patent teaches all aspects of the claimed invention with the exception of a "ring-shaped chamber connected on one side to exhausting devices and on the other to ducts." Applicant notes that '436 now also fails to teach or suggest the newly recited detachable connections/couplings as explained above. Applicant also reiterates the failure of Corsi '436 to teach or suggest a replaceable chuck. Corsi '190 equally fails to teach or suggest the newly recited detachable connections/couplings or a replaceable chuck.

Thus, claims 35-36 are believe to be novel and nonobvious.

Claims 29-30 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,286,146 to Corsi. The examiner however states "Alternatively, '146 is silent about the drive of the tool held by the "chuck" of "second support" 3. Thus, Corsi '146 fails to teach or suggest a "drive connected to a chuck of said chuck unit" as recited in claim 29. Corsi '146, like Corsi '436, also fails to teach or suggest the newly recited detachable connections/couplings which facilitate interchangeability without disassembling the tool head, taking the device apart, or requiring any tools for disassembly.

Claims 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious from Corsi '146 in view of U.S. Patent 5,322,494 to Holtey et al. The examiner states that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted a motorized driver and series of interchangeable spindles as taught by Holtey et al. for the conventional tool holder or "chuck" and the chuck structure 3 taught by '146.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Corsi '146 nor Holtey '494 teaches or suggests the newly recited detachable connections/couplings of claim 29, which facilitate interchangeability without disassembling the tool head, taking the device apart, or requiring any tools for disassembly. Furthermore, Holtey '494 teaches away from the claimed invention and Corsi '146. Thus, not only is the claimed invention not made obvious from Holtey '494, but Corsi '146 and Holtey '494 are not combinable. As the examiner clearly stated, Holtey teaches substituting a motorized driver and series of interchangeable spindles as taught by Holtey et al. for the conventional tool holder or "chuck" and the chuck structure 3 taught by '146. By stark contrast, applicant recites

"an interchangeable chuck unit projecting from the second support," and not interchangeable spindles which replace a tool holder.


Claim 30 depends from claim 29 and is therefore novel and nonobvious for the same reasons as claim 29.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain which may be resolved by telephonic communication, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, if such will advance the application to allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Yan Glickberg
Reg. No. 51,742
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: June 1, 2004

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706